REMARKS

Herein, the "Action" or "Office Action" refers to the Office Action dated June 5, 2003.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the application. Claims 1-13, 23, 24, 35, and 39-56 are presently pending. Claims amended herein are 12, 35, 39, 40, 42, 45, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, and 56 . No claims are cancelled herein. No new claims are added herein.

The Applicant expressly grants permission to the Office to interpret all pending claims of this application.

Prior Art Status of References

Applicant does not explicitly or implicitly admit that any reference is prior art. Nothing in this communication should be considered an acknowledgement, acceptance, or admission that any reference is considered prior art.

The § 101 Rejections

Claims 39 and 40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter.

The Patent Office has provided an "Examination Guideline for Computer-Related Inventions" which is particularly instructive in considering the above claim rejections. In this guideline, the Office discusses non-statutory subject matter as such relates to computer-related inventions. Specifically, the Office describes two types of descriptive material—functional and non-functional.

Functional descriptive material consists of data structures and computer programs which impart functionality when encoded on a computer-readable medium. Such data structures and programs are statutory when embodied on a computer-readable medium. Applicant amends these claims to clarify that the data structures do, in fact, reside on computer-readable media.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are in proper format and are allowable as indicated above.

The § 102 Claim Rejections

Claims 23, 44, 46, 47, 50, 53, and 55 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e). Applicant traverses these rejections and asks that they be withdrawn and the case passed along to issuance.

The Office's rejections are based upon the following reference:

Griffin: *Griffin et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 6,442,714.

Applicant expressly reserves the right to file a § 131 declaration with respect to Griffin.

The § 103 Claim Rejections

Claims 1-13, 24, 35, 41-43, 45, 48, 49, 51, 52, 54, and 56 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Applicant traverses these rejections and asks that they be withdrawn and the case passed along to issuance.

The Office's rejections are based upon the following references:

Griffin; and

Smith, *Jody K. Smith*, U.S. Patent No. 6,018,748.

Applicant expressly reserves the right to file a § 131 declaration with respect to Smith.

Claims 1-7

Claim 1 recites a spider-friendly Web page generation method comprising [emphasis added]:

- generating an instance of a main Web page having at least one link with a dynamic address pointing to a dynamic Web page; and
- ***converting the dynamic address into a static address*** that also points to the dynamic Web page.

In making out the rejection of claim 1, the Office argues that the recited act of "***converting the dynamic address into a static address*** that also points to the dynamic Web page" is disclosed by Griffin in column 3, lines 35-42, and column 5, lines 25-45.

As described by Griffin in col. 5, lines 30-43, Griffin takes the information after the "?" in a URL and converts it to a series of command-line parameters and passes them to a Perl script. Applicant submits this is quite different than ***converting a dynamic address*** pointing to a dynamic Web page ***into a static address*** that also points to the dynamic Web page.

Griffin passes input parameters to a script that performs some acts. It appears that these acts may include loading a dynamic Web page. Applicant submits that this behavior is consistent with what Applicant describes on page 2 and 3 of the Background section of the present application. Griffin does not appear to convert the address from one form into another form.

Applicant respectfully submits that there appears to be no disclosure or suggestion in Griffin to convert addresses.

If Griffin does indeed disclose it, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office point out the precise text within Griffin that discloses a ***static address*** that points to a ***dynamic web page***.

As neither Griffin, nor, by the Examiner's own admission, Smith, disclose the feature of converting a static address to a dynamic address, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is allowable. Accordingly, Applicant asks the Office to withdraw its rejection.

Claims 2-7 depend from claim 1 and are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 1, are neither disclosed nor suggested in the references of record, either singly or in combination with one another. Accordingly, Applicant asks the Office to withdraw its rejections.

Claims 8-13

Claim 8 recites a static to dynamic (S-to-D) Web address conversion method comprising [emphasis added]:

- receiving a request for a dynamic Web page, the request including a static address pointing to the dynamic Web page; and
- ***converting the static address to a dynamic address*** also pointing to the dynamic Web page.

In making out the rejection of claim 8, the Office argues that the recited act of "***converting the static address to a dynamic address*** also pointing to the dynamic Web page" is disclosed by Griffin in column 5, lines 5-45.

As described by Griffin in col. 5, lines 30-43, Griffin takes the information after the "?" in a URL and converts it to a series of command-line parameters and passes them to a Perl script. Applicant submits this is quite different than ***converting the static address to a dynamic address that*** also points to the dynamic Web page. Applicant respectfully submits that there appears to be no disclosure or suggestion in Griffin to convert addresses.

If Griffin does indeed disclose it, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office point out the precise text within Griffin that discloses a conversion of a static address to a dynamic address.

As neither Griffin, nor, by the Examiner's own admission, Smith, disclose the feature of conversion of a static address to a dynamic address. Accordingly, Applicant asks the Office to withdraw its rejection.

Claims 9-13 depend from claim 8 and are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 8, are neither disclosed nor suggested by the references of record, either singly or in combination with one another. Accordingly, Applicant asks the Office to withdraw its rejections.

Claims 23-24

Claim 23 recites a dynamic to static (D-to-S) Web address conversion method comprising [emphasis added]:

- receiving a dynamic address pointing to a dynamic Web page; and
- ***converting the dynamic address to a static address*** also pointing to the dynamic Web page.

In making out the rejection of claim 23, the Office argues that the recited act of "***converting the dynamic address to a static address*** also pointing to the dynamic Web page" is disclosed by Griffin in column 3, lines 22-64.

Applicant submits that Griffin's behavior (as disclosed at column 3, lines 22-64) is consistent with the conventional addressing and generating of dynamic Web pages (as described on page 2 and 3 of the Background section of the present application). Griffin does not appear to convert the address from one form into another form.

Applicant submits that Griffin does not appear to disclose or suggest address conversion. If Griffin does, Applicant is unable to locate the specific text that does this. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office specifically point out any such text.

Applicant respectfully submits that Griffin does not disclose ***converting a dynamic address*** pointing to a dynamic Web page ***to a static address*** also pointing to the dynamic Web page.

As neither Griffin, nor, by the Examiner's own admission, Smith, disclose the feature of ***converting a dynamic address*** pointing to a dynamic Web page ***to a static address*** also pointing to the dynamic Web page. Accordingly, Applicant asks the Office to withdraw its rejection.

Claim 24 depends from claim 23 and is allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. This claim is also allowable for its own recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 23, are neither disclosed nor suggested by the references of record, either singly or in combination with one another. Additionally, given the allowability of claim 23, the addition of the

Smith reference in the rejection of claim 24 is not seen to add anything of significance. Accordingly, Applicant asks the Office to withdraw its rejection.

Claim 35

Claim 35 recites a method of providing a dynamic Web page comprising [emphasis added]:

- ***receiving a request for a dynamic Web page*** from a computer on a network, the request including a ***static Web address pointing to the dynamic Web page***;
- generating an instance of the dynamic Web page such that contents of the instance appears as a static Web page; and
- sending the dynamic Web page to the computer.

In making out the rejection of claim 35, the Office argues that the recited act of "***receiving a request for a dynamic Web page*** from a computer on a network, the request including a ***static Web address pointing to the dynamic Web page***" is disclosed by Griffin in column 3, lines 22-64, and column 4, lines 5-30.

Applicant submits that Griffin's behavior (as disclosed by the cited excerpts of Griffin) is consistent with the conventional addressing and generating of dynamic Web pages (as described on page 2 and 3 of the Background section of the present application). As is conventional, Applicant submits that requests for dynamic Web pages received by Griffin include a dynamic address (and not a static one).

Applicant submits that Griffin does not appear to disclose or suggest a static Web address pointing to a dynamic Web page. If Griffin does, Applicant is unable to locate the specific text that does this. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office specifically point out any such text.

Applicant submits that Griffin does not disclose "***receiving a request for a dynamic Web page*** . . . the request including a ***static Web address pointing to the dynamic Web page***."

As neither Griffin, nor, by the Examiner's own admission, Smith, disclose the feature of "***receiving a request for a dynamic Web page*** . . . the request including a ***static Web address pointing to the dynamic Web page***." Accordingly, Applicant asks the Office to withdraw its rejection.

Claim 41

Claim 41 recites a Web site system comprising [emphasis added]:

- a Web server hosting a dynamic Web site;
- a database storing data used by the Web server to generate dynamic Web pages of the dynamic Web site, the Web server being operatively coupled to the Web server; and
- a static to dynamic (S-to-D) Web address converter, the converter being operatively coupled to the Web server;
- the S-to-D Web address converter being configured to ***convert a static address to a dynamic address*** pointing to a dynamic Web page.

In making out the rejection of claim 41, the Office argues that the recited "S-to-D Web address converter being configured to ***convert a static address to a dynamic address*** pointing to a dynamic Web page" is disclosed by Griffin in column 3, lines 35-42, and column 5, lines 25-45.

Applicant submits that Griffin's behavior (as disclosed by the cited excerpts of Griffin) is consistent with the conventional addressing and generating of dynamic Web pages (as described on page 2 and 3 of the Background section of the present application).

Applicant submits that Griffin does not appear to disclose or suggest address conversion. If Griffin does, Applicant is unable to locate the specific text that does this. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office specifically point out any such text.

Applicant submits that Griffin does not disclose ***converting a static address to a dynamic address*** pointing to a dynamic Web page.

As neither Griffin, nor, by the Examiner's own admission, Smith, disclose the feature of ***converting a static address to a dynamic address*** pointing to a dynamic Web page. Accordingly, Applicant asks the Office to withdraw its rejection.

Claim 42

Claim 42 recites a Web site system comprising [emphasis added]:

- a Web server hosting a dynamic Web site;
- a database storing data used by the Web server to generate dynamic Web pages of the dynamic Web site, the database being operatively coupled to the Web server; and
- a dynamic to static (D-to-S) Web address converter, the converter being operatively coupled to the Web server;

- the D-to-S Web address converter being configured to ***convert a dynamic address*** pointing to a dynamic Web page ***into a static address*** also pointing to the dynamic Web page.

In making out the rejection of claim 42, the Office argues that the recited "D-to-S Web address converter being configured to ***convert a dynamic address*** pointing to a dynamic Web page ***into a static address*** also pointing to the dynamic Web page" is disclosed by Griffin in column 3, lines 35-42, and column 5, lines 25-45.

Applicant submits that Griffin's behavior (as disclosed by the cited excerpts of Griffin) is consistent with the conventional addressing and generating of dynamic Web pages (as described on page 2 and 3 of the Background section of the present application).

Applicant submits that Griffin does not appear to disclose or suggest address conversion. If Griffin does, Applicant is unable to locate the specific text that does this. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office specifically point out any such text.

Applicant submits that Griffin does not disclose ***converting a dynamic address*** pointing to a dynamic Web page ***into a static address also*** pointing to the dynamic Web page.

As neither Griffin, nor, by the Examiner's own admission, Smith, disclose the feature of ***converting a dynamic address*** pointing to a dynamic Web page ***into a static address also*** pointing to the dynamic Web page. Accordingly, Applicant asks the Office to withdraw its rejection.

Claim 43

Claim 43 recites a server comprising [emphasis added]:

- a processor;
- a request receiver executable on the processor to receive a request including a static address of a main Web page;
- a spider-friendly Web page generator executable on the processor to:
 - ***receive the static address*** of the main Web page from the request receiver;
 - generate an instance of the main Web page having at least one link with an address pointing to a dynamic Web page.

In making out the rejection of claim 43, the Office argues that the recited "spider-friendly Web page generator executable on the processor to: ***receive the static address*** of the main Web page from the request receiver" is disclosed by Griffin in column 3, lines 22-64, and column 5, lines 20-46.

Applicant submits that Griffin's behavior (as disclosed by the cited excerpts of Griffin) is consistent with the conventional addressing and generating of dynamic Web pages (as described on page 2 and 3 of the Background section of the present application). Applicant submits that Griffin is silent on what it would do if it received a static address rather than a dynamic one.

Applicant submits that Griffin does not appear to disclose or suggest a spider-friendly Web page generator executable on a processor to: ***receive the static address*** of the main Web page from the request receiver. If Griffin does, Applicant is unable to locate the specific text that does this. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office specifically point out any such text.

Applicant submits that Griffin does not disclose a spider-friendly Web page generator executable on a processor to: ***receive the static address*** of the main Web page from the request receiver.

As neither Griffin, nor, by the Examiner's own admission, Smith, disclose the feature of a spider-friendly Web page generator executable on a processor to: ***receive the static address*** of the main Web page from the request receiver. Accordingly, Applicant asks the Office to withdraw its rejection.

Claim 44

Claim 44 recites a server comprising [emphasis added]:

- a processor;
- a static to dynamic (S-to-D) Web address converter executable on the processor to:
 - ***convert a static address*** pointing to a dynamic Web page ***into a dynamic address*** that also points to the dynamic Web page.

In making out the rejection of claim 44, the Office argues that the recited "S-to-D Web address converter executable on the processor to: ***convert a static address*** pointing to a dynamic Web page ***into a dynamic address*** that also points to the dynamic Web page" is disclosed by Griffin in column 3, lines 35-42, and column 5, lines 25-45.

As described by Griffin in col. 5, lines 30-43, Griffin takes the information after the "?" in a URL and converts it to a series of command-line parameters and passes them to a Perl script. Applicant submits this is quite different than ***converting a static address*** pointing to a dynamic Web page ***into a dynamic address*** that also points to the dynamic Web page.

Griffin passes input parameters to a script that performs some acts. It appears that these acts may include loading a dynamic Web page. Applicant submits that this behavior is consistent with what Applicant describes on page 2

and 3 of the Background section of the present application. Griffin does not appear to convert the address from one form into another form.

Applicant respectfully submits that there appears to be no disclosure or suggestion in Griffin to convert addresses.

If Griffin does indeed disclose it, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office point out the precise text within Griffin that discloses a ***static address*** that points to a ***dynamic web page***.

As neither Griffin, nor, by the Examiner's own admission, Smith, disclose the feature of a ***static address*** that points to a ***dynamic web page***. Accordingly, Applicant asks the Office to withdraw its rejection.

Claim 45

Claim 45 recites a server comprising [emphasis added]:

- a processor;
- a static to dynamic (S-to-D) Web address converter executable on the processor to:
 - ***parse a static address*** to identify at least one value associated with a field within the static address; and
 - generating a dynamic address incorporating at least one value associated with the field, wherein the dynamic address points to the dynamic Web page.

In making out the rejection of claim 45, the Office argues that the recited "S-D Web address converter executable on the processor to: ***parse a static address*** to identify at least one value associated with a field within the static address" is disclosed by Griffin in column 3, line 65 to column 4, line 11. A portion of that cited excerpt is set forth below [emphasis added]:

> When a user fills in the requested job information and sends a request to the web server, the test application server receives the filled-in web form ***data values,*** parses the ***data values***, and checks mandatory fields of the form for missing or obviously erroneous data.

Griffin parses ***data values*** from a filled-in web form. Furthermore, Griffin appears to parse the parameters of the dynamic address (like that in col. 5, lines 30-43) in generating a dynamic Web page.

Applicant submits that neither action involves parsing of a ***static address***. Applicant respectfully submits that there appears to be no disclosure or suggestion in Griffin to parse static addresses.

If Griffin does indeed disclose it, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office point out the precise text within Griffin that discloses generating a ***dynamic address*** incorporating at least one value associated with a field parsed from a ***static address***.

As neither Griffin, nor, by the Examiner's own admission, Smith, disclose the feature of generating a ***dynamic address*** incorporating at least one value associated with a field parsed from a ***static address***. Accordingly, Applicant asks the Office to withdraw its rejection.

Claim 46

Claim 46 recites a server comprising [emphasis added]:

- a processor;
- a dynamic to static (D-to-S) Web address converter executable on the processor to:
 - ***convert a dynamic address*** pointing to a dynamic Web page ***into a static address*** also pointing to the dynamic Web page.

In making out the rejection of claim 46, the Office argues that the recited "D-to-S Web address converter executable on the processor to: ***convert a dynamic address*** pointing to a dynamic Web page ***into a static address*** also pointing to the dynamic Web page" is disclosed by Griffin in column 3, lines 22-64.

Applicant submits that Griffin's behavior (as disclosed by the cited excerpts of Griffin) is consistent with the conventional addressing and generating of dynamic Web pages (as described on page 2 and 3 of the Background section of the present application).

Applicant submits that Griffin does not appear to disclose or suggest ***converting a dynamic address*** pointing to a dynamic Web page ***into a static address*** also pointing to the dynamic Web page. If Griffin does, Applicant is unable to locate the specific text that does this. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office specifically point out any such text.

If Griffin does indeed disclose it, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office point out the precise text within Griffin that discloses a ***static address*** that points to a ***dynamic web page***.

As neither Griffin, nor, by the Examiner's own admission, Smith, disclose the feature of a ***static address*** that points to a ***dynamic web page***. Accordingly, Applicant asks the Office to withdraw its rejection.

Claim 47

Claim 47 recites a system for hosting dynamic Web sites comprising [emphasis added]:

- a Web server for dynamically generating an instance of a dynamic Web page; and

- a spider-friendly Web page generator configured to:
 - generate an instance of a main Web page having at least one link with a dynamic address pointing to a dynamic Web page; and
 - ***convert the dynamic address into a static address*** that also points to the dynamic Web page.

In making out the rejection of claim 47, the Office argues that the recited "spider-friendly Web page generator configured to: ***convert the dynamic address into a static address*** that also points to the dynamic Web page" is disclosed by Griffin in column 5, lines 22-64.

Applicant submits that Griffin's behavior (as disclosed by the cited excerpts of Griffin) is consistent with the conventional addressing and generating of dynamic Web pages (as described on page 2 and 3 of the Background section of the present application).

Applicant submits that Griffin does not appear to disclose or suggest ***converting a dynamic address into a static address*** that also points to the dynamic Web page. If Griffin does, Applicant is unable to locate the specific text that does this. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office specifically point out any such text.

Applicant submits that Griffin does not disclose ***converting a dynamic address into a static address*** that also points to the dynamic Web page.

If Griffin does indeed disclose it, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office point out the precise text within Griffin that discloses a ***static address*** that points to a ***dynamic web page***.

As neither Griffin, nor, by the Examiner's own admission, Smith, disclose the feature of a ***static address*** that points to a ***dynamic web page***. Accordingly, Applicant asks the Office to withdraw its rejection.

Claims 48-49

Claim 48 recites a system for hosting dynamic Web sites comprising [emphasis added]:

- a Web server for dynamically generating an instance of a dynamic Web page in response to a request; and
- a static to dynamic (S-to-D) Web address converter;
- the Web server being configured to send a Web address of the request to the converter;
- the converter being configured to:
 - receive the Web address of the request;
 - determine if the Web address is a static address; and
 - ***convert the static address to a dynamic address*** that also points to the dynamic Web page.

In making out the rejection of claim 48, the Office does not cite any portion of Griffin or Smith that discloses or suggests the recited converter being configured to: "***convert the static address to a dynamic address*** that also points to the dynamic Web page."

As described by Griffin in col. 5, lines 30-43, Griffin takes the information after the "?" in a URL and converts it to a series of command-line parameters and passes them to a Perl script. Applicant submits this is quite different than than ***converting a static address*** pointing to a dynamic Web page ***into a dynamic address*** that also points to the dynamic Web page.

Griffin passes input parameters to a script that performs some acts. It appears that these acts may include loading a dynamic Web page. Applicant

submits that this behavior is consistent with what Applicant describes on page 2 and 3 of the Background section of the present application. Griffin does not appear to convert the address from one form into another form.

Applicant respectfully submits that there appears to be no disclosure or suggestion in Griffin to convert addresses.

If Griffin does indeed disclose it, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office point out the precise text within Griffin that discloses ***converting a static address*** pointing to a dynamic Web page ***into a dynamic address*** that also points to the dynamic Web page.

As neither Griffin, nor, by the Examiner's own admission, Smith, disclose the feature of ***converting a static address*** pointing to a dynamic Web page ***into a dynamic address*** that also points to the dynamic Web page. Accordingly, Applicant asks the Office to withdraw its rejection.

Claim 49 depends from claim 48 and is allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. This claim is also allowable for its own recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 48, are neither disclosed nor suggested in the references of record, either singly or in combination with one another. Accordingly, Applicant asks the Office to withdraw its rejection.

Claims 50-51

Claim 50 recites a system for hosting dynamic Web sites comprising [emphasis added]:

- a Web server for dynamically generating an instance of a dynamic Web page; and
- a dynamic-to-static (D-to-S) Web address converter being configured to:

- ***convert a dynamic address*** pointing to a dynamic Web page ***into a static address*** that also points to the dynamic Web page.

In making out the rejection of claim 50, the Office argues that the recited "D-to-S Web address converter being configured to: ***convert a dynamic address*** pointing to a dynamic Web page ***into a static address*** that also points to the dynamic Web page" is disclosed by Griffin in column 3, lines 35-42, and column 5, lines 25-45.

Applicant again submits that Griffin does not appear to disclose or suggest address conversion. If Griffin does, Applicant is unable to locate the specific text that does this. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office specifically point out any such text.

Applicant submits that Griffin does not disclose ***converting*** a ***dynamic address*** pointing to a dynamic Web page ***into a static address*** that also points to the dynamic Web page.

As neither Griffin, nor, by the Examiner's own admission, Smith, disclose the feature of ***converting*** a ***dynamic address*** pointing to a dynamic Web page ***into a static address*** that also points to the dynamic Web page . Accordingly, Applicant asks the Office to withdraw its rejection.

Claim 51 depends from claim 50 and is allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. This claim is also allowable for its own recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 50, are neither disclosed nor suggested in the references of record, either singly or in combination with one another. Additionally, given the allowability of claim 50, the addition of the Smith

reference in the rejection of claim 51 is not seen to add anything of significance. Accordingly, Applicant asks the Office to withdraw its rejection.

Claim 52

Claim 52 recites a computer-readable storage medium having computer-executable instructions that, when executed by a computer, performs a spider-friendly Web page generation method comprising [emphasis added]:

- generating an instance of a spider-friendly Web page having at least one link with a dynamic address pointing to a dynamic Web page; and
- ***converting the dynamic address into a static address*** that also points to the dynamic Web page.

In making out the rejection of claim 52, the Office argues that the recited act of "***converting the dynamic address into a static address*** that also points to the dynamic Web page" is disclosed by Griffin in column 3, lines 22-63.

Applicant again submits that Griffin (including this cited excerpt) does not appear to disclose or suggest address conversion. If Griffin does, Applicant is unable to locate the specific text that does this. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office specifically point out any such text.

Applicant submits that Griffin does not disclose ***converting a dynamic address into a static address*** that also points to the dynamic Web page.

As neither Griffin, nor, by the Examiner's own admission, Smith, disclose the feature of ***converting a dynamic address into a static address*** that also points to the dynamic Web page. Accordingly, Applicant asks the Office to withdraw its rejection.

Claim 53

Claim 53 recites a computer-readable storage medium having computer-executable instructions that, when executed by a computer, performs a static to dynamic (S-to-D) Web address conversion method comprising [emphasis added]:

- receiving a request for a dynamic Web page, wherein the request includes a static address pointing to the dynamic Web page; and
- ***converting the static address to a dynamic address*** that also points to the dynamic Web page.

In making out the rejection of claim 53, the Office argues that the recited act of "***converting the static address to a dynamic address*** that also points to the dynamic Web page" is disclosed by Griffin in column 3, lines 22-63, and column 5, lines 20-45.

As described by Griffin in col. 5, lines 30-43, Griffin takes the information after the "?" in a URL and converts it to a series of command-line parameters and passes them to a Perl script. Applicant submits this is quite different than ***converting a static address to a dynamic address*** that also points to the dynamic Web page.

Griffin passes input parameters to a script that performs some acts. It appears that these acts may include loading a dynamic Web page. Applicant submits that this behavior is consistent with what Applicant describes on page 2 and 3 of the Background section of the present application. Griffin does not appear to convert the address from one form into another form.

Applicant respectfully submits that there appears to be no disclosure or suggestion in Griffin to convert addresses.

If Griffin does indeed disclose it, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office point out the precise text within Griffin that discloses ***converting a static address to a dynamic address***.

As neither Griffin, nor, by the Examiner's own admission, Smith, disclose the feature of ***converting a static address to a dynamic address***. Accordingly, Applicant asks the Office to withdraw its rejection.

Claim 54

Claim 54 recites a computer-readable storage medium having computer-executable instructions that, when executed by a computer, performs a static to dynamic (S-to-D) Web address conversion method comprising [emphasis added]:

- receiving a static address pointing to a dynamic Web page;
- ***parsing the static address*** to identify at least one value associated with a field within the static address; and
- generating a dynamic address incorporating at least one value associated with the field, wherein the dynamic address points to the dynamic Web page.

In making out the rejection of claim 54, the Office argues that the recited act of ***parsing the static address*** to identify at least one value associated with a field within the static address is disclosed by Griffin in column 3, line 64, to column 4, line 12.

Griffin parses ***data values*** from a filled-in web form. Furthermore, Griffin appears to parse the parameters of the dynamic address (like that in col. 5, lines 30-43).

Applicant submits that neither action involves parsing of a ***static address***. Applicant respectfully submits that there appears to be no disclosure or suggestion in Griffin to parse static addresses.

If Griffin does indeed disclose it, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office point out the precise text within Griffin that discloses generating a ***dynamic address*** incorporating at least one value associated with a field parsed from a ***static address***.

As neither Griffin, nor, by the Examiner's own admission, Smith, disclose the feature of generating a ***dynamic address*** incorporating at least one value associated with a field parsed from a ***static address***. Accordingly, Applicant asks the Office to withdraw its rejection.

Claim 55

Claim 55 recites a computer-readable storage medium having computer-executable instructions that, when executed by a computer, performs a dynamic to static (D-to-S) Web address conversion method comprising [emphasis added]:

- receiving a dynamic address pointing to a dynamic Web page; and
- ***converting the dynamic address to a static address*** that also points to the dynamic Web page.

In making out the rejection of claim 55, the Office argues that the recited act of "***converting the dynamic address to a static address*** that also points to the dynamic Web page" is disclosed by Griffin in column 5, lines 20-45..

Applicant again submits that Griffin (including this cited excerpt) does not appear to disclose or suggest address conversion. If Griffin does, Applicant is

unable to locate the specific text that does this. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office specifically point out any such text.

Applicant submits that Griffin does not disclose ***converting a dynamic address into a static address*** that also points to the dynamic Web page.

As neither Griffin, nor, by the Examiner's own admission, Smith, disclose the feature of ***converting a dynamic address into a static address*** that also points to the dynamic Web page. Accordingly, Applicant asks the Office to withdraw its rejection.

Claim 56

Claim 56 recites a computer-readable storage medium of claim 55 the instructions for performing converting comprising [emphasis added]:

- parsing the dynamic address to identify and separate fields within the dynamic address, wherein at least one field has a value; and
- ***generating the static address*** incorporating the value of at least one field, wherein the static address points to the dynamic Web page.

In making out the rejection of claim 56, the Office argues that the recited act of "***generating the static address*** incorporating the value of at least one field, wherein the static address points to the dynamic Web page" is disclosed by Griffin in column 3, line 64, to column 4, line 12.

Griffin parses ***data values*** from a filled-in web form. Furthermore, Griffin appears to parse the parameters of the dynamic address (like that in col. 5, lines 30-43).

Applicant submits that Griffin does not disclose generation of a ***static address*** that incorporates the value associated with at least one field parsed from a

dynamic address. Applicant respectfully submits that there appears to be no disclosure or suggestion in Griffin to generate a ***static address*** in this manner.

If Griffin does indeed disclose it, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office point out the precise text within Griffin that discloses generation of a ***static address*** that incorporates the value associated with at least one field parsed from a ***dynamic address***.

As neither Griffin, nor, by the Examiner's own admission, Smith, disclose the feature of generation of a ***static address*** that incorporates the value associated with at least one field parsed from a ***dynamic address***. Accordingly, Applicant asks the Office to withdraw its rejection.

Claim Amendments

Applicant amends claims 12, 35, 39, 40, 42, 45, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, and 56 for grammatical purposes only and not for any statutory reason.

Conclusion

All pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the Office is urged to contact the undersigned attorney before issuing a subsequent Action.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: 9-4-03 By: _____

Kasey C. Christie
Reg. No. 40559
(509) 324-9256 x232
kasey@leehayes.com
www.leehayes.com